



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/978,600	10/15/2001	Corinna Herrnstadt	660088.401C9	5296
500	7590	10/01/2003	EXAMINER	
SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC 701 FIFTH AVE SUITE 6300 SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092			KETTER, JAMES S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1636	

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

09/978,600

Applicant(s)

HERRNSTADT ET AL.

Examiner

James S. Ketter

Art Unit

1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1636

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1 and 2, drawn to a method of inhibiting transcription or translation of mutant cytochrome c oxidase genes, classified in class 514, subclass 44.
- II. Claims 3-6, drawn to a probe for the detection of disease associated with mutant cytochrome c oxidase gene, classified in class 536, subclass 24.31.
- III. Claims 7 and 8, drawn to therapeutic compositions of antisense molecules specific to mutant cytochrome c oxidase genes, classified in class 536, subclass 24.5.
- IV. Claims 9 and 10, drawn to a method of detecting Alzheimer's Disease using antibodies to a variant peptide, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
- V. Claim 11, drawn to a ribozyme adapted to hybridize to and cleave mutant cytochrome c oxidase mRNA, classified in class 435, subclass 196.

In Group I, claim 1 links the inventions in claim 2. **Applicant must elect a single invention as recited in Claim 2 if Group I is chosen. This is not a species election, as the inventions are patentably distinct.** The invention in Group I from which the election is to be made is a particular mutant form of one of the recited cytochrome c oxidase genes, i.e., having one of the mutations recited in claim 2 or a single combination of the recited mutations. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claim 1. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or

Art Unit: 1636

divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

In Group II, claims 3 and 5 link the inventions in claims 4 and 6. **Applicant must elect a single invention as recited in Claim 3 and 5 if Group II is chosen. This is not a species election, as the inventions are patentably distinct.** The invention in Group II from which the election is to be made is a particular mutant form of one of the recited cytochrome c oxidase genes, i.e., having one of the mutations recited in claims 4 and 6 or a single combination of the recited mutations. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claims 3 and 5. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

In Group III, claim 7 links the inventions in claim 8. **Applicant must elect a single invention as recited in Claim 8 if Group III is chosen. This is not a species election, as the inventions are patentably distinct.** The invention in Group III from which the election is to be made is a particular mutant form of one of the recited cytochrome c oxidase genes, i.e., having one of the mutations recited in claim 8 or a single combination of the recited mutations. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claim 7. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

In Group IV, claims 9 and 10 are drawn to, and thus link multiple, patentably distinct inventions. **Applicant must elect a single invention if Group IV is chosen, the inventions being a single disclosed mutant form of cytochrome c oxidase I or II. This is not a species election, as the inventions are patentably distinct.** The invention in Group IV from which the election is to be made is a particular mutant form of one of the recited cytochrome c oxidase genes. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance

Art Unit: 1636

of the linking claims 9 and 10. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

In Group V, claim 11 is drawn to, and thus links multiple, patentably distinct inventions. **Applicant must elect a single invention if Group V is chosen, the inventions being a ribozyme adapted to a single disclosed mutant form of cytochrome c oxidase I or II mRNA. This is not a species election, as the inventions are patentably distinct.** The invention in Group V from which the election is to be made is a ribozyme specific for a particular mutant form of one of the recited cytochrome c oxidase genes. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim 11. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the

Art Unit: 1636

continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of Groups I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions, i.e., a method of inhibition of transcription and a nucleic acid probe, the purpose of which is detection.

Inventions of Groups II, III, IV and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions, i.e., a method of inhibition of transcription and a nucleic acid probe, the purpose of which is detection, or different modes of operation, i.e., detection of a disease with a nucleic acid versus detection of a disease using an antibody against a polypeptide, or antisense binding to inhibit expression versus ribozyme hydrolysis of mRNA.

Inventions of Groups III and I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the

Art Unit: 1636

product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case expression may be inhibited by a materially different product, e.g., ribozymes, which are mutually exclusive of antisense molecules.

Inventions of Groups V and I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case expression may be inhibited by a materially different product, e.g., antisense molecules, which are mutually exclusive of ribozymes.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the

Art Unit: 1636

application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted directly to the Examiner by facsimile transmission at (703) 746-5155. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(see 37 CFR ' 1.6(d)). To send the facsimile to the Art Unit instead, the Art Unit 1636 Fax number is (703) 305-7939. NOTE: If Applicant does submit a paper by fax to this number, the Examiner must be notified promptly, to ensure matching of the faxed paper to the application file, and the original signed copy should be retained by Applicant or Applicant's representative. (703) 308-4242 or (703) 305-3014 may be used without notification of the Examiner, with such faxed papers being handled in the manner of mailed responses. Applicant is encouraged to use the latter two fax numbers unless immediate action by the Examiner is required, e.g., during discussions of claim language for allowable subject matter. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner with respect to the examination on the merits should be directed to James Ketter whose telephone number is (703) 308-1169. The Examiner normally can be reached on M-F (9:00-6:30), with alternate Fridays off.

Application/Control Number: 09/978,600


Page 9

Art Unit: 1636

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Remy Yucel, can be reached at (703) 305-1998.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1234.

Jsk
September 22, 2003



**JAMES KETTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER**